UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE		FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.		
09/505,619 02/16/2000		Ronald A. Katz	PAT-009B	6020		
29129 MICHELLE	7590 04/02/2007 A. ZARINELLI		EXAMINER			
C/O WEST C	CORPORATION	GARG, YOGESH C				
	CLE HILLS DR. : W11-LEGAL		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
OMAHA, NI	· · ·		3625			
		•				
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE		
			04/02/2007	PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
09/505,619	KATZ ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Yogesh C. Garg	3625		

		rogoon or oarg		0020	
	The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover shee	et with the d	orrespondence add	ress
THE	REPLY FILED <u>06 March 2007</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS AP	PLICATION IN CONDI	TION FOR	ALLOWANCE.	
	The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance time periods:	ving replies: (1) an ame tice of Appeal (with ap ce with 37 CFR 1.114.	endment, aff peal fee) in (	idavit, or other eviden compliance with 37 C	rce, which FR 41.31; or (3)
a)	$\square$ The period for reply expires $3$ months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.			
b)	The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or to the statutory period for reply expire to the period for reply expires to the period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event.	ater than SIX MONTHS fro (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b	om the mailin	g date of the final rejection	on.
	TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7	``			
have to under set for may re	sions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ex 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the sthin (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office latereduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) CE OF APPEAL	tension and the correspor shortened statutory period than three months after t	nding amount I for reply orig	of the fee. The appropri inally set in the final Office	ate extension fee ce action; or (2) as
2. 🔲	The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exte a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed NDMENTS	nsion thereof (37 CFR	41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of th	
3. 🛚	The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,	but prior to the date of	filing a brief,	, will <u>not</u> be entered be	ecause
	(a) They raise new issues that would require further co		rch (see NO	TE below);	
	(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo				
	<ul><li>(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or</li></ul>	ter form for appeal by	materially re	ducing or simplifying	the issues for
	(d) They present additional claims without canceling a	corresponding number	of finally rej	ected claims.	
_	NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.1				
_	The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.13		e of Non-Co	mpliant Amendment (	(PTOL-324).
5. 📙	Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)				
6. 📙	Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be al non-allowable claim(s).		·	-	_
	For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is protected to:  Claim(s) allowed:  Claim(s) objected to:  Claim(s) rejected:			ll be entered and an e	explanation of
	Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:				
<u>AFFI(</u>	DAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE		,		
	The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).				
	The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome all rejections	under appe	al and/or appellant fai	ls to provide a
	The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation JEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the cl	aims after e	ntry is below or attach	ned.
	The request for reconsideration has been considered bu See Continuation Sheet.	t does NOT place the a	application in	n condition for allowar	nce because:
12. 🗀	Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No	(s)	$\sim$ $/$	
13. [	Other:			Whya	<u> </u>
				Yogesh C Garg Primary Examiner	

Application No. 09/505,619

## **Continuation Sheet (PTO-303)**

Continuation of 3. NOTE: Limitation in the currently amended independent claim 172, "the upsell is successful in providing the customer with the second good or service in repalcement thereof" raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search..

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: (a). Due to current amendment as stated above it raises new issues, (b) the applicant has not responded to the rejection of claim 174 under 35 USC 112, first paragraph in the final action mailed on 12/6/2006, and (c) the current amendment does not overcome the rejection of claim 172 under 35 USC 112, first paragraph because "offering the second good or service to the to the prospective customer in lieu of the first good or service whereby the upsell serves to obviate the purpose for the primary transaction and the upsell is successful in providing the customer with the second good or service in replacement thereof" is new matter .

The applicant's provided support (see Remarks, pages 16-18) in the disclosure is directed to the following limitation: " offering a new product to the prospective customer in lieu of the requested service or repair whereby the upsell serves to obviate the purpose for the primary transaction and the upsell is successful in providing the customer with the new product in replacement thereof " and this is not the same as the currently added limitation recited in claim 172. The limitation in claim 172 is broader than the applicant's disclosure because it recites offering either a good or service in lieu of a requested service or good but, the disclosure does not disclose that offering a new service in lieu of a request of a product whereby the upsell serves to obviate the purpose for the primary transaction and the upsell is successful in providing the customer with the new service in replacement thereof.